

United States Patent and Trademark Office

1

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/751,679	12/29/2000	Anthony X. Jarvis	00-BN-067 (STMI01-00067)	9128	
30425	7590 08/18/2		EXAM	EXAMINER	
STMICROELECTRONICS, INC. MAIL STATION 2346			LI, AIMEE J		
	TRONICS DRIVE	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CARROLLTON, TX 75006			2183		
			DATE MAILED: 08/18/200	DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/751,679	JARVIS ET AL.
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit
	Aimee J. Li	2183
TI MANUAL DATE SU:	45 4 4 4 4	

Advisory Action	09/751,679	JARVIS ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Aimee J. Li	2183					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ess				
THE REPLY FILED 27 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31, or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. 							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for 							
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21 See attached Notice of Non Co	ampliant Amandment	(DTOL 224)				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)):	Impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).	6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro-	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ w vided below or appended.	ill be entered and an ε	explanation of				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>9,10,19,20 and 25</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-7,11-17 and 21-23. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	at before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered necessary				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 			ice because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 13. ☑ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .							
•							
			·				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues in essence on pages 11-13 "...Hull lacks any mention that the stop bit is used with multiple 'syllables' of a single instruction. More specifically, Hull lacks any mention that the stop bit is used to identify the highest 'syllable' of a single isntruction." This has not been found persuasive. Hull teaches in column 4, lines 11-13 that the S-bit (stop bit) specifies whether an instruction group boundary occurs after the last instruction. An instruction group, in Hull, refers to a group of three instructions, i.e. syllables, grouped together with a template field into a 128-bit sized field (Hull column 3, lines 22-28), so the S-bit is applicable to the grouped instruction, i.e. three syllables. Also, the claim language states "using a stop bit in a highest syllable of one of the instructions to determine whether every syllable of the instruction has been stored in the first buffer." There is exactly what the S-bit of Hull does. It denotes to Hull's device whether the instruction group continues into the next instruction bundle (Hull column 4, lines 11-19), i.e. whether the next group needs to be read for all syllables in the bundle to be read. There is nothing in the claim language suggesting that the stop bit identifies "the highest 'syllable' of a single instruction", as is argued.

Continuation of 13. Other: The proposed amendment will be entered because it reduces issues for appeal in the case. Namely, the proposed amendment removes the objection to claim 25.

EDDIE CHAN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100